

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed January 30, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein.

Claims 1-22 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 23-50 remain in the present application. Claims 51 and 52 have been added to the present application.

The Specification has been amended to correct previously undetected informalities. No new matter has been added.

In the January 30, 2004 Office Action, claims 29-31 and 43-45 were objected to for informalities. Claims 29-31 and 43-45 have been amended as suggested by the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claims 29-31 and 43-45 are no longer objectionable.

In the January 30, 2004 Office Action, claims 23-27, 30-41, and 44-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,460,025 issued to Fohn et al. (hereinafter "Fohn") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,774 issued to de Hita et al. (hereinafter "de Hita"). As discussed below, Applicant has amended claims 23-50 to clearly distinguish over Fohn in view of de Hita. For example, amended claim 23 states:

A method comprising:
 recognizing a change to content of a user-populated list of
 items from an item space;

generating a query in response to the change, said query being based on characteristics of the items indicated in the user-populated list; and
applying the query to the item space to identify a second list of items.

In amended claim 23, a list has been populated by a user with items from an item space. When the content of the list changes, a query is generated based on characteristics of the items listed by the user. The query is then applied to the item space to identify a second list of items.

In other words, when the user-populated list changes, claim 23 uses the characteristics of the listed items to identify another list of items. For example, as discussed in the specification, a user can list documents that are of interest, and an embodiment of claim 23 can use characteristics of the listed documents to identify and list related documents. Each time the user's list changes, the list of related documents could be updated.

Fohn, in contrast, is directed to navigating and browsing through hierarchies of information (Fohn: col. 1, lines 9-13). Each hierarchy is organized into nodes, with a root node at the top, leaf nodes at the bottom, and intermediate nodes in between (Fohn: col. 7, lines 42-45). The leaf nodes are called entities, which are specific products or parts that are categorized by the higher levels of nodes (Fohn: col. 7, lines 64-65; col. 8, lines 42-56). As a user moves through hierarchies by selecting different root nodes and intermediate nodes, Fohn's invention displays different sets of entities based on what Fohn calls the "structural" and "state" relevance of particular entities with respect to the user's position and path through the hierarchies (Fohn; col. 9, lines 26-29; col.

18, line 55 to col. 19, line 12; col. 20, lines 5-14). Navigating down to the leaf nodes by selecting an entity has no effect on the sets of entities that are displayed (Fohn; col. 19, lines 18-21).

In other words, Fohn changes a list of entities in response to navigations among hierarchical nodes. Amended claim 23, on the other hand, identifies a list of items from an item space in response to a change in a user-populated list of items from that same item space.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fohn has nothing whatsoever to do with using a change in a list of items to trigger the identification of other items. Therefore, Applicant suggests that Fohn does not suggest, disclose, or enable “generating a query in response to” ... “a change to content of a user-populated list of items from an item space,” as claimed in amended claim 23.

de Hita was cited for teaching a natural language information retrieval system. Assuming for the sake of argument that the Office Action is correct with respect to the teachings of de Hita, Applicant respectfully submits that de Hita does not cure the deficiency of Fohn discussed above.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 23 is patentable over Fohn in view of de Hita.

Applicant submits that the reasoning presented above with respect to amended claim 23 similarly applies to claims 24-27, 30-41, and 44-50, as amended. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully

submits that claims 24-27, 30-41, and 44-50 are likewise patentable over Fohn in view of de Hita.

In the January 30, 2004 Office Action, claims 28, 29, 42, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fohn in view of de Hita, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,434 issued to Zhai (hereinafter "Zhai"). Zhai was cited for teaching a method for profile score threshold setting. Assuming for the sake of argument that the Office Action is correct with respect to the teachings of Zhai, Applicant respectfully submits that Zhai does not cure the deficiency of Fohn and de Hita discussed above. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28, 29, 42, and 43 are patentable over Fohn in view of de Hita further in view of Zhai.

New claims 51 and 52 depend from claims 23 and 37, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits new claims 51 and 52 are likewise patentable over the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23-52, as amended, are now in a condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of such claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

INTEL CORPORATION

Date: Mar 30, 2004


Robert A. Diehl
Reg. No. 40,992

INTEL LEGAL
SC4-202
P.O. Box 5326
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326
Phone: (503) 712-1880
FAX: (503) 264-1729